

Brian Bates
24239 Linnea Court
Moreno Valley, CA 92553

March 26, 1992

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

Toward the end of the 1991-1992 school year, I will be engaging in a research project that will be led by a college professor. She has requested that Advanced Placement American History students serve as researchers. The final product will be a CD ROM computer data-base on the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and his death as a window into the 1960's. My A.P. American History teacher has also asked me to research with him the new movie, *JFK*, and how it uses typical methods of the film industry to make a point (e.g., music, camera angles, black and white shots, etc.). The product of that will be a CD computer disk which will be used in history classrooms to teach this important historical incident.

As I hear is the case with so many critics of the "official" version of what happened that day in Dallas, after diving into the preliminary aspects of this project I can no longer sit back and listen to official government press releases and such with a submissive mind. I find myself questioning more and more what I am told to believe, as I am sure so many "midnight house-researchers" have done before me. I have no doubt that you know what I'm writing about.

In reading the many research materials, beginning with Mr. Mark Lane's "Rush to Judgement" and continuing with Mr. Lifton's "Best Evidence", your many self-published works have come up more than coincidentally. I have been very careful which materials I read (at the urging of other serious critics in print, who cast warnings of paranoid fanatics who rape the grave nature of the cause), only choosing those endorsed and used as reference by many other respected authors. In one book, the author used this address as a foot-note and in the bibliography, writing that one could obtain copies of your self-published books for a cost. Could you please provide me with a list of the costs for these books, as I am very interested in reading your books?

Thank you very much for your time, and I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Brian Bates". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Brian Bates

Mr. Brian Bates
24239 Linnea Court
Moreno Valley CA 92553

3/31/91

Dear Mr. Bates,

The list of my books for which you asked is enclosed. However, the rest of your letter troubles me because you intend to evolve what "will be used in history classrooms to teach this important historical incident" and what you reflect in your letter leads me to believe that you will not be able to do that responsibly because, while you are skeptical of some of the conspiracy theorizing books you cannot evaluate others.

Almost no books on the JFK assassination are restricted entirely to fact. "Rush to Judgement" pretty much was but that was Lane's last contact with reality and he angled that as most cannot perceive. For example, in his supposed verbatim ^{with} of the Warren Commission volumes he eliminates the names of virtually all couns^e/_l, which are in the verbatim transcripts, substituting "counsel" as I recall. But he does ~~not~~ not do this with Warren and Rankin so the reader's anger is focused on them only and the rest of the staff is exculpated.

Sylvia Neagher's "Accessories after the Fact" and Howard Roffman's "Presumed Guilty" are two superb books but they have n^ot been available for years.

But the rest are flawed in various ways and magnitude and seriousness. Some are very persuasive, Lifton's in particular, but you are n^ot in a position to evaluate his honesty. If you were familiar with the earlier substantial and factual books you'd have perceived that all that is factual in his book and for which he takes credit as the discoverer was published many years earlier and he takes personal credit for the work of others. And if you were familiar with the established fact of the assassination you'd know that his theory is at each step impossible. For example, in addressing his integrity, you will I believe remember that he says that the body was switched from the casket in which it left Dallas and when it got to the Navy hospital it was in a body bag. His theory begins with a statement in the FBI's Sibert^o'Neill report that there had been surgery on the head. Yet in so large a book he did not include this report. The reason is clear if you have that report. I reproduce it in facsimile in "Post Mortem." In the same paragraph in which these agents make an incorrect reference to surgery of the head they say that they helped remove the body from the casket in which it had been transported from Dallas and that it was wrapped in sheets, not a body bag.

I wish I could take more time but I'm almost 79, in seriously impaired health and there are too many limitations on me now. But I do not know how even with the help of your history teacher you can research Stone's "JFK." It is based on two of the ~~worst~~ worst and least factual assassination books. Garrison's, which is knowingly dishonest-^{as Garrison} as Stone knew and intended - and Marrs' compendium of all the nutty theories when he was so ignorant he did not know what he was writing about even relating to them!

Two months before he started shooting, when I learned that Stone was basing his movie on Garrison's disgraceful rewriting of his own fiasco and ^{Stone} said he would be recording their "his^tory" for the people, telling them "who" killed their President, "why" and "how," I wrote him in some detail. I gave him a full account of the deliberate dishonesty of the Garrison book and of several ghastly misrepresentations in it. I had been asked by some of his staff to try to prevent his planned commemoration of the fifth assassination anniversary after they had failed. Two of the incidents of which I told Stone truthfully and in detail were ^{about} Garrison's "assassins" he was going to charge.

To abort his planned atrocity I had to investigate what he called "the tramp pictures," because on the basis of them alone he was going to charge a man he did not like and imagined is in those pictures with being an assassin. He had nothing else. And as the Dallas police records recently confirmed, I was correct in saying that they had no connection with the assassination at all, were merely winos drinking it up when they were found in a parked railroad boxcar a block west of the scene and two and a half south of it about an hour and a half later.

Garrison also planned to charge as another assassin the former husband of Nancy Perrin Rich, Robert M. Perrin - even though he knew that Perrin had killed himself in New Orleans more than a year earlier.

Stone never replied, never had any interest in having access that I give to all writers to the quarter of a million pages I got from the government, formerly withheld records disclosed to me by court compulsion in a series of Freedom of Information lawsuits. At the same time Stone was propagandizing his movie with the false allegation that "all" official records were withheld until at least the year 2039. Sometimes when he could lie no longer he moderated this some until just before his movie was released he got closer to the truth for it.

Stone himself remains so ignorant of the fact of the assassination he had to be prompted by assistants when he was to appear on Nightline. The satellite carried that and I have a transcript of it. He even asked what he should say about JFK's fatal shot!

But to simplify this for you, how factual do you think Stone intended to be when he knew all these records were available to him, did not want to see a page of them and then lied repeatedly about their being suppressed; and how factual and honest did he intend to be when he was silent in response to my letter warning him before he started shooting?

He told one of his theorizing assistants that he was really using the JFK assassination as a vehicle for saying what he wanted to say about Viet Nam. So for that he did not need to know a single fact about the assassination and went with the incredible lies and nuttiness he knew he could make attractive and did.

If this seems harsh or exaggerated to you I suggest that you and/or your teacher get in touch with Dr. David Wrone, professor of history at the Univ. of Wisconsin, Stevens